

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

APRIL 4, 2016

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld
Mark Winings, Aldermanic Representative
Craig Owens, City Manager
Ron Reim
Sherry Eisenberg
Pepe Finn

Absent:

Josh Corson

Also in Attendance:

Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Planning Director
Louis Clayton, Planner

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off, that conversations take place outside the meeting room and that those who wish to speak approach the podium and to be sure the green light on the microphone is on for proper recording of this meeting.

MINUTES

The minutes of the March 28, 2016 meeting were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – MODIFICATION TO SIGN ORDINANCE/SIGNAGE – 8300 & 8400 MARYLAND AVENUE

Andy Hrdlicka, sign contractor, and Kathy Cooksey representing Caleres were in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the applicant is proposing to remove the 32.27-square-foot sign currently located above the building entrance at 8300 Maryland Avenue and install it above the main building entrance to 8400 Maryland Avenue. A 50.14-square-foot sign of the same design and materials will then be installed above the building entrance at 8300 Maryland Avenue. Both

signs will be reverse/halo illuminated with warm white LED lights. Susan noted that single tenant office buildings are permitted one 25-square-foot wall sign on each building elevation with street frontage. The proposed signs exceed the allowable size and therefore a sign modification is requested. Susan stated that the proposed signs are made of high quality materials and are consistent with the design and materials of the existing buildings; however, they do not meet the requirements of the Sign Ordinance. According to the Sign Ordinance, modifications should only be granted due to unusual conditions of the building or site. Each building has two street frontages and is therefore each is permitted two 25 square foot signs. The modification will result in single signs larger than permitted; however, the proposed signs are approximately the same size (8300 Maryland Avenue) or smaller (8400 Maryland Avenue) than the 50 square foot combined signage permitted per building. The proposed signs are appropriately sized given the large size of the buildings. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed placement, size, design and materials of the signs is appropriate in consideration of the characteristics of the building and site, and staff supports granting the requested sign modification and approval with the condition that the applicant secure a sign permit prior to installation.

Mr. Hrdlicka commented that the proposal is pretty straightforward. He asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that he agrees with staff's report.

Hearing no questions or comments from the remaining Board members or from the audience, Chairman Lichtenfeld called for a motion.

Ron Reim made a motion to approve the proposal as requested per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Craig Owens and unanimously approved by the Board.

EXTERIOR ALTERATION – COMMERCIAL – 7610 WYDOWN BOULEVARD

Zoe Robinson, proposed tenant/restaurant owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the subject property is located on the north side of Wydown Boulevard between Forest Court and Westwood Drive and has a zoning designation of C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District. The property contains a one-story commercial building, most recently occupied by Yo My Goodness. In conjunction with an interior renovation of the building [to accommodate a new restaurant], the applicant proposes to make the following alterations to the front façade

1. Install new storefront windows and doors made of tempered glass and black framing.
2. Construct a new black canvas awning.
3. Install new rooftop mechanical screening made of metal panels painted black.

Based on the City's Bicycle Parking Regulations the proposed restaurant is required to provide one bicycle rack; however, the applicant requests that this requirement be waived. A bicycle rack cannot be accommodated on site in accordance with the Bicycle Parking Regulations due to the footprint of the existing building. The public sidewalk directly in front of the restaurant is intended to be used as outdoor dining. Three existing bicycle racks are located across the street at Wydown Park, +/- 110 feet from the restaurant entrance. For these reasons staff has approved the request to waive the requirement for one bicycle rack. The proposed changes to the front façade are relatively minor and are consistent with the design and materials used on adjacent commercial buildings and staff recommends approval as submitted.

Ms. Robinson referred to the pictures she provided that depict the proposed storefront door/windows.

Pepe Finn asked if the doors open out.

Ms. Robinson indicated that she believes they do. She stated that on a day like today, she will leave them open to bring the outside in and in the winter, will have one locked and use the other for the entry door.

A brief discussion regarding controlling the inside temperature during the winter took place. Ms. Robinson stated that the awning will have curtains that will help block the cold air.

Sherry Eisenberg asked if there is a mechanical screen currently on the building.

Ms. Robinson replied "yes", noting that it is 8-feet back from the building edge so it's not highly visible. She stated that she will be bidding out the screening material and may use a black canvas as opposed to the black metal; either way, it will be black and 8-feet back, so it will basically disappear.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked Ms. Robinson to provide staff the information if it is different than the black metal. He commented that if the screening material is 8-feet back from the edge of the building, it probably will not be visible except from across the street.

Hearing no further questions or comments and hearing none from the audience, Chairman Lichtenfeld called for a motion.

Ron Reim made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Pepe Finn and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked Ms. Robinson when she plans to open.

Ms. Robinson indicated October-November.

Chairman Lichtenfeld told Ms. Robinson that the City appreciates her opening up a 3rd restaurant.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 8121
PERSHING AVENUE

Paul Fendler, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the existing 2-story home measures 2,157 square feet and was constructed in 1938. The existing detached garage measures 382 square feet and was also constructed in 1938. The proposed project consists of the demolition of an existing one-story building addition, the construction of a 2-story 823-square-foot addition to the rear of the home, and an 84-square-foot addition to the west side of the detached garage. The height of the addition is +/- 21 feet from average existing grade to the mid-point of the roof. The roof of the addition will be clad in fiberglass shingles to match existing. White double-hung windows are proposed to match existing. The existing home has brick on the first floor and lap siding on the second floor. The primary building materials for the home addition are brick and white Hardie Board lap siding. The home addition is not visible from the street and will incorporate the same design and materials found on the existing home. The amount of Hardie Board lap siding will cover 50 percent of each elevation. The Architectural Review Guidelines limit the use of accent materials to 25 percent of each elevation and gives the Architectural Review Board authority to grant a modification to exceed 25 percent siding, up to a maximum of 30 percent. The detached garage will measure +/- 10 feet tall as measured from grade to the mid-point of the roof. A single white garage door is proposed. The detached garage addition will be constructed of brick. The existing roof will be removed and a new roof clad in asphalt shingles is proposed. Hardie Board lap siding will be used on the gable ends on the north and south elevation. The building materials will match those on the home. The amount of Hardie Board lap siding will cover 58 percent of the south elevation. The Architectural Review Guidelines limit the use of accent materials to 25 percent of each elevation and gives the Architectural Review Board authority to grant a modification to exceed 25 percent siding, up to a maximum of 30 percent. The total amount of Hardie Board lap siding on the north and south elevations is the same; however, the percentage is higher on the south façade because the garage door is excluded from the calculation. The existing driveway will remain in place. A low Versa-lok retaining wall is proposed around the rear patio and will not be visible from public view. No permanent fences are proposed. The existing HVAC units are located on the west side of the home, and are shown to be screened by deciduous shrubs. The applicant has agreed to revise the plans to provide 100 percent opaque evergreen shrubs in lieu of the proposed deciduous shrubs. A 40-square-foot trash enclosure is located on the west side of the detached garage and will be screened by a wood fence and gate. Susan stated that the project as proposed is in conformance with the requirements of the R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The amount of Hardie Board lap siding used on the home and the south elevation of the detached garage exceeds the 25 percent permitted by the Architectural Review Guidelines; however, staff is of the opinion that given the existing design and materials of the existing home; the proposed design and materials meet the spirit of this requirement and are compatible with the existing home and on other homes in the

neighborhood and that staff recommends approval with the following condition, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. That the applicant submit a revised site plan showing 100 percent opaque evergreen shrubs to screen the HVAC units.

Mr. Fendler indicated that the addition won't be visible from the street and that the materials will match existing.

Mark Winings asked if this Board's authority goes beyond the 30%.

Susan Istenes replied "yes", noting the compatibility issue.

Mark Winings commented that the addition would look funny constructed of something else.

Chairman Lichtenfeld noted that the existing house contains more than 50% siding.

Ron Reim stated that more than 30% of a siding material [stucco] has been before.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that the grading is not affected by this project.

Mr. Fendler concurred.

Ron Reim asked if the HVAC units will meet setback requirements.

Mr. Fendler replied "yes".

Hearing no further questions or comments and hearing none from the audience, Ron Reim made a motion to approve per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mark Winings and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION/EXTERIOR ALTERATION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 844 AUDUBON

Ted & Shannon Quinn, owners, and Donna Boxx, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the 12,697-square-foot site is located on the northeast corner of Audubon Drive and Hillvale Drive, and has a zoning designation of R-2 Single-Family Dwelling District. The existing one and a half story home was built in 1920 and measures 3,463 square feet. The project consists of a major renovation to the existing residence and multiple additions totaling

654 square feet. The proposed additions and alterations are located at multiple locations around the home as listed below:

1. Two story addition on the north elevation.
2. Second floor addition on the south elevation.
3. Second floor addition on the west elevation.
4. New pitched roofs over four existing one-story flat roofs on the north, west, east and south elevations.

A new and expanded exposed aggregate driveway and retaining walls are proposed. The existing tuck under, rear loading garage will remain. The height of the home with the new additions is 26-foot 8-inches as measured from average existing grade to the peak of the roof. The additions will be constructed of stucco to match the home. The roof of the additions is clad with stone-coated steel that has the appearance of clay tiles. A standing seam metal roof is proposed on the rear elevation above the garage and on the one-story sunroom. Brown wood casement windows are proposed to match the home. The existing concrete driveway will be replaced with a new exposed aggregate driveway. The driveway will lead to a rear loading garage with a brown carriage style garage door. The plans show the HVAC units located at the rear of the home and not visible from public view. Trash and recycling receptacles will be stored adjacent to the garage and will not be visible from public view. Two tiered retaining walls are proposed adjacent to the driveway and will be constructed of Versa-Lok Mosaic modular blocks in a weathered finish. No permanent fences are proposed. Susan stated that the project as proposed is in conformance with the requirements of the R-2 Single Family Dwelling District and the Architectural Review Guidelines. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed design and materials of the additions and alterations is consistent with the existing design and materials on the home and recommends approval as requested.

Ms. Boxx presented a roof sample to the members. She noted that they are proposing steel (Gerard panel) that will not be damaged by hail. She stated that they have addresses of other homes that have used this roofing material.

Ron Reim asked if they are replacing the entire roof.

Ms. Boxx replied “yes”.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that they “win the prize” for having the most complicated residential roof he’s ever seen.

Ms. Quinn informed the members that the roofing material they are proposing, which is light compared to tile, has a 100 year warranty.

Pepe Finn complimented them on this project; she said she has been in this house and it has been neglected.

A brief discussion regarding the roofing material ensued. It was noted that the roof will show areas of shading/color variations.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Ron Reim made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Craig Owens and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked when they plan to begin construction.

Ms. Quinn replied “as soon as possible.”

Chairman Lichtenfeld thanked them for updating the older home.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked about the Annual Report.

Staff indicated that it would be placed on the next agenda.

Ron Reim began a discussion regarding plan submittal requirements, noting that he spoke with a representative of the State Architectural Board; the state doesn't require an architect seal on single-family or 2-family projects but the County does. He stated that Bart (the City's Building Official) indicated to him that it's a matter of policy/procedure to require signed/sealed plans that are submitted for building permit. He added that he believes that it is assumed that the plans this Commission/Board reviews have been prepared by an architect. He stated that the issue is a non-licensed designer illegally misrepresenting him/herself and that this is something that the Board of Aldermen may want to address.

Chairman Lichtenfeld questioned how to clarify the validity of plan sets.

Susan Istenes asked if the concern is about the drawings that come before this Board as she would be more concerned about the plans that are submitted for permit.

Ron Reim responded that at first, he wasn't sure, but the State representative said we should pay more attention and that they've ran into several falsely prepared documents including copying a title block. He asked who is held responsible/accountable if plans differ between the ones approved at this level and the ones submitted for permit. He said that the State representative indicated that there are two options: stamping these plans “preliminary” or submitting the same plans to this Board as are submitted for permit.

City Attorney O'Keefe noted that this Board most notably focuses on compatibility, aesthetics, and character issues and less on technical aspects. He stated that the burden is on the applicant to submit plans that correspond with this Board's approval and if they don't, the Building Official would not issue the permit.

Ron Reim indicated that he is not sure the coordination is that close between the two divisions.

City Attorney O'Keefe stated this is something that can be looked into.

Ron Reim commented that he believes it is prudent for us to do so. He made reference to the 51 & 53 Arundel situation whereas the architect listed on the submitted plans was not really an architect.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that the transparency should be there; we shouldn't have to ask for it.

Ron Reim stated that he doesn't practice residential.

Craig Owens asked staff if they can have some information back to this Board within 30 days.

A discussion regarding whether or not to add "public comment" to future agendas ensued. It was decided that the format of the agenda would not be changed.

Being no further question or comments, this meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Recording Secretary